DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 283 HE 016 269

AUTHOR Johnson, Deborah Hazel; Troy, Warwick G.
TITLE Activities and Needs of UMBC Students. Research Report 1/81.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., Catonsville, Baltimore County. Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.
PUB DATE Jan 81
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Catonsville, MD 21228.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Enrollment Influences; *Extracurricular Activities; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Needs Assessment; *Student Characteristics; *Student College Relationship; Student Employment; *Student Needs; Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS *University of Maryland Baltimore County

ABSTRACT

Student perceptions of the University of Maryland Baltimore Campus (UMBC) as well as student interactions with the campus were studied through a formal needs analysis. It was found that UMBC students were fairly pragmatic and career-oriented, based on their reasons for attending college, their choice of UMBC, their current employment, and their problem areas. For about a third of the students, UMBC was their only choice of colleges. The three primary reasons for attending college were: to obtain a better job; to prepare for graduate or professional school; and to meet new people. Twenty-four percent lived on campus and 76 percent off campus. Four percent of the students had one or more children requiring child care; about 28 percent were employed on campus, and 45 percent were employed off campus. Females and black students appeared to be less involved at UMBC, and each of the campus gathering places had its own distinctive student subgroup that it attracted. In addition, there was a sizable subgroup of students who were uninvolved on campus, some of whom were not interested in spending more time on campus. There also were important gaps between students' needs for help in certain areas and whether they actually received such help. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Board of Education of Baltimore County

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Catonsville, Maryland 21228

Activities and Needs of UMBC Students

Deborah Hazel Johnson
Research Coordinator, Student Affairs
Psychologist, Counseling Center

Warwick G. Troy
Director
Counseling Center

Research Report 1/81

The authors would also like to acknowledge gratefully the important contributions of Gail Bartkovich, who took prime responsibility for designing the questionnaire, Debbie Craig, whose office gathered most of the data, and David Herman, whose office aided in distributing questionnaires.

INTRODUCTION

Program development in Student Affairs divisions in colleges and universities is especially difficult in times of fiscal uncertainty, reduction in budgetary support, and increased demands for accountability. It is crucial, therefore, that scarce resources be put into only those programs for which there is a manifest need and which can be expected to reach the widest target audiences.

Although UMBC has always systematically maintained a student data base, such information has been designed primarily to serve the purposes of descriptive institutional research (large statistical reporting for federal and state compliance), rather than to facilitate student development research. Nor is the kind of student data base currently maintained particularly useful as an empirical base for the development of service programs for a heterogeneous student body in academic support areas such as Student Affairs. Again, while the Counseling Center and the Office of Institutional Research have for many years collected student characteristics data on successive cohorts of incoming freshmen via an instrument developed by the American Council on Education, neither do these data lend themselves to specific program building.

What was required, then, was a formal needs analysis survey designed to identify both student perceptions of the UMBC campus and students' interaction with the campus. For the survey data to have utility beyond the immediate present and for it to serve the needs of a number of departments in the division of Student Affairs, it was essential that there were a mix of demographic and subjective questions, both general and highly specific. Nonetheless, the requirement of a good data base for program development in the academic support area will mean that needs analyses of the kind described in this report will still have to be conducted at regular intervals.

While this survey was designed in the first instance to serve the utilitarian concerns of program development in the Counseling Center and the newly-created Office of Commuter Affairs, it is hoped that the report as a whole will be of general interest to the wide UMBC community.

The statistics for our sample and for the UMBC population are as follows:

	Sample	Population
Sex		
Male	45%	44%
Female	55%	56%
Class rank		
Freshman	37%	45%
Sophomore	21%	25%
Junior	23%	18%
Senior	17%	12%
Race		
White	74%	75%
Black	19%	20%
Other	7%	5%
Residence		
On-campus	24%	20%
Off-campus	76%	80%
Student Status		
Full-time	97%	90%
Part-time	3%	10%

Although the research sample is slightly over-representative of upperclassmen and full-time students compared to the student body at large, generalizations can be made with reasonable confidence.

Results

For the sake of clarity, we will describe the results by topic area. Since for many of these topic areas it was of interest to know whether various student subgroups differed, we will follow the description of general results with delineations of any subgroup differences on that topic area. Breakdowns on relevant items were done by sex, residence, race, and age. Only those differences are reported which statistically were larger than we would expect by chance alone (i.e., the results had less than 5 chances out of 100 of occurring by chance).

Initial interest in UMBC. For 36% of the students, UMBC was the only college to which they had applied. Another 41% of them had applied to one or two other schools, while 23% applied to three to 14 other schools. For about a third of our students, then, UMBC was their one and only choice of schools. The average number of other colleges to which our students had applied was 1.5.

The main three reasons for having decided to attend college were: 1) to be able to get a better job (77%), 2) to prepare for graduate or professional school (62%), and 3) to meet new and interesting people (48%). UMBC students thus seem primarily interested in the vocational and social aspects of college, rather than seeing college as something to do if a job could not be found or as a place to go to get away from home.

Given this emphasis in deciding to attend college, how did these students choose UMBC in particular? The convenient location ranked as the top reason for deciding to attend UMBC (61%), followed by UMBC's good academic reputation (53%), and the fact that UMBC had specific academic programs of interest (50%). The practical matter of location appears to be UMBC's major drawing point, but the academics of this school are a strong back-up reason. Only 5% of the students said they came here because they were not accepted anywhere else. UMBC seems to be drawing vocationally-oriented students who want a combination of close location and good academics.

For such a new school, the number of alumni and former students advising prospective students to come here is impressive. About a quarter of the students said that someone who went here before them advised them to attend. In contrast, only 7% came because relatives wanted them to attend UMBC. While recruitment by former UMBC students appears to be an important strength, further recruitment through adults in the community would seem to be possible.

Residents and travel. We have previously mentioned that 24% of our sample lives on-campus and 76% off-campus. Of those living off-campus, four-fifths live with their parents and one-fifth live separately from their parents. These statistics are consistent with students' interest in UMBC's convenient location; for many people, UMBC provides an opportunity for a good college education while living at home.

However, these commuters do travel quite a bit to get here. Of those students commuting to UMBC from off-campus, 20% commute 1-5 miles, 39% commute 6-20 miles,

and 41% commute more than 20 miles, round trip. The main methods of transportation are cars, either alone (60%) or in a carpool (19%), and public buses (15%). Very small percentages of students walk or ride bicycles (2%) or are dropped-off at the campus (17%), probably because of UMBC's rather distant location from most residential areas.

Children. Four percent of the students had one or more children requiring child care. Almost the same percentage said that they would use a campus day care service at UMBC if it were available. While this proportion is small, it must be remembered that if the same proportion of students in the total student population were interested in using on-campus day care, the number of those students would total about 240, many of whom have more than one child. Particularly if UMBC is interested in attracting more non-traditional aged students, it appears that there is a need for a child care service.

Employment. About 28% of the students are employed on campus, and about 45% are employed off campus. Of those employed on campus, 90% work less than 20 hours per week. In contrast, of those students employed off campus, a much smaller percentage work less than half-time. 64% of these off-campus workers work half-time or less.

Interestingly, white students tend more often to be employed off-campus than do students of other races. 52% of the white students are employed off campus, in contrast to 27% of the Orientals and Hispanics and 17% of the Blacks. No such large differences occur among students regarding on-campus employment. It is unclear why there is such a higher rate of off-campus employment for whites.

Male and female students do not have differences in terms of employment, either on-campus or off-campus. In contrast to traditional sex-role stereotypes, females just as frequently hold jobs as do males, and the number of hours they work is similar.

Comparing younger (traditional-aged college students: 21 or under) and older (over 21) students, more older than younger students are employed on campus. 37% of the older students are employed on campus, as compared to 23% of the younger students. However, there is no difference between younger and older students employed on campus in terms of for how many hours they are employed. The reverse situation happens for off-campus workers. While about the same percentage of younger and older students are employed off campus, most older students are employed half-time or more (38%) than are younger students (23%).

In sum, nearly a quarter of the sample works more than half-time off campus. A large percentage of these students are white and/or over 21. For such students, UMBC represents only one aspect of their lives, in contrast to the traditional college student whose primary occupation was attending school. With such a large percentage of students engaged in at-least part-time jobs, program development at UMBC cannot proceed as it might have on a more traditional college campus.

Time on campus. According to our survey, 80% of the students are on campus in the mornings, with Monday and Wednesday mornings having highest attendance and Thursday morning the lowest. About 75% of our sample are here in the afternoons, with Monday and Wednesday again being peak times and Friday afternoon having lowest attendance. About 25% of the students are here on any given weekday evening.

Some differences did arise across student subgroups. An obvious difference is the relative absence of commuters on campus in the evenings and weekends, but commuters also tended to be more frequently off campus on Thursday afternoons. Black students also tend to be off campus at that time, as well as on Friday afternoons. Perhaps surprisingly, no differences arose between older and younger students regarding on-campus times; both groups tended to be equally well represented on campus at all times, even nights and weekends.

It is not clear whether these time patterns occur during all semesters, or just happened to occur during the semester of our survey. The Computer Science

Center is currently releasing a report of peak class enrollment times, which may partially address this point. However, students do remain on campus at times other than during scheduled classes, and probably for activity-planning purposes, this non-scheduled time is of most interest.

We therefore asked students how much time they spend on campus when they are not in classes. 18% leave immediately after classes. 38% say that they frequently spend time on campus when not in classes. As expected, residents spend more free time on campus than do commuters. Such differences also occur for males versus females and across races. Males spend more free time on campus than do females. Blacks tend to spend least time compared to other races, while whites spend most time. There is no difference in the amount of free time that younger and older students spend on campus.

How do students feel about the amount of time they spend on campus? Would they spend more time here if they had fewer outside commitments? 62% are satisfied with their amount of time on campus, while 18% are not interested in spending more time because there is nothing here of interest to them. Again as expected, commuters more often than residents would like to spend more time here. Females, whom we earlier found to spend less time here, are more dissatisfied with their on-campus amount of time than are males, but their dissatisfaction is about equally spread between wanting more time and not wanting more time because of nothing interesting here. The pattern for blacks is quite similar, with more blacks than students of other races either wishing they could spend more time here but being unable to due to external commitments, or not wanting more time here because of lack of interesting on-campus things to do. Again, there is no difference between younger and older students.

One might speculate about the implications of these results in several ways. First, Mondays and Wednesdays may be optimal days to schedule club meetings and activities, to reach the widest possible number of students. Secondly, about a fifth of our students find so little of interest to them here outside of classes

that they come to campus only to attend classes. While about the same proportion must leave due to external commitments (job, family, etc.), we cannot any longer comfortably assume that many of our students are inactive here due to their commuting. We have a significant number of students who might be better served here if we could offer more activities. The new Student Union will be a major step forward in fulfilling this need. Third, females and blacks seem less "hooked-in" to UMBC than do other student subgroups: they spend less time here, and find less of interest to them. Specific programs oriented toward the specialized needs of these two subgroups appear to be well warranted. We might also question whether the atmosphere at UMBC is as conducive as possible to making these subgroups feel comfortable here.

Involvement on campus. While students are spending free time on campus, there are a number of types of activities in which they can engage. The most frequent attendance is at club meetings, in which 32% of the students participate. Concerts, athletics, and lectures each involve about 28% of the students.

These activities differentially attract students from different subgroups. Residents are much more frequently involved in all activities than are commuters, with the greatest difference being in athletics, in which 49% of the residents are involved versus 21% of the commuters. Females more typically go to concerts than do males (33% vs. 23%), but attend other activities in similar proportions to those of males. Black students are most involved in going to lectures or seminars (40%), while Hispanic and Oriental students are most active in clubs (48%). More older students attend lectures (35%) than do younger students (23%).

The three most popular places to spend time on campus are the Student Union, the Library, and the Commuter Cafeteria. Each place seems to attract certain student subgroups more than others: black students go to the Union (50%) much more than do Hispanics and Orientals (10%), while Blacks spend less time in the gym or pool (18%) than do students of other races (36% each for whites and Hispanics and Orientals). Fewer females go to Hillcrest (47%) than do males (10%).

Younger students more often can be found in the Union (43%) or Commuter Cafeteria (57%) than can older students (26% go to the Union and 45% to the Cafeteria). Older students specified that they spend more time in on-campus places other than the above than do younger students (27% vs. 17%).

Clearly different student subgroups have very different interests, and these are manifested in the places and activities attracting each type of student. Given the above percentages, certain types of activities could be tailored specifically to suit the type of student most frequently attending. For example, lectures and seminars could often be oriented toward the interests of older and/or black students, although of course not to the exclusion of other subgroups. Alteratively, perhaps the wide differences may be due to existing topics and service policies. Perhaps the lecture series attracts these subgroups because of its typical topics; in this case, a wider range of topics could appeal to more diverse student subgroups. Probably the most important implication of this area of results is that a campus serving such a diversity of students continually provide a diversity of places and activities to accommodate the various needs.

Problem areas. We asked students in which areas they had had questions or problems while at UMBC. The three main problem areas were exploring career choices and decisions (48%), selecting appropriate courses (40%), and looking for a job (34%).

Subgroups again experienced quite different types of concerns. Residents had had more questions or problems on academic skills (39% vs. 25%), financial problems (42% vs. 29%), housing (28% vs. 15%), and University regulations (26% vs. 15%) than had commuters, while commuters had more questions on transportation (26% vs. 14%). Males and females had no significant differences in problem areas. Students of all minority races had more concerns about looking for a job (50% vs. 28%) and academic problems (40% vs. 25%) than did white students, while Orientals and Hispanics experienced more questions or problems on University regulations (32% vs. 15%) than did whites or blacks. Students over 21 noted more difficulties in financial problems (52% vs. 27%), personal problems (27% vs. 12%), and University regulations

(25% vs. 14%) than did traditional-aged students.

Given such problem areas, in what areas did students feel they had received useful help from someone at UMBC? The three major areas of receiving help were on course selection (34%), academic skills (28%), and exploring career choices (25%). It is probably not coincidental that these help areas overlap with the problem areas.

Do student subgroups differ on receiving help? Here it is important to note that we merely asked students whether they felt they had actually received useful help. We cannot tell whether a "no" answer indicates that the student did not seek help or that the student sought help but found the help not useful. Residents noted that they were helped more on career exploration (33% vs. 22%), illness (17% vs. 4%), personal problems (16% vs. 7%), and housing (27% vs. 4%) than were commuters. It is quite possible that commuters look off-campus for such help, while residents use people at UMBC to obtain help. Males and females noted no differences in receiving help. The only race-related difference occurred in help for academic skills: 39% of the blacks, 26% of the whites, and 17% of the other minorities received such help. Older students more often got help on looking for jobs (18% vs. 10%), career exploration (35% vs. 19%), financial problems (24% vs. 12%), and personal problems (14% vs. 6%), as compared to younger students.

Comparing problem areas to areas of receiving help, one wonders about what happened to students with questions or problems in an area but who did not receive help. For example, while 48% of the students had concerns about career decisions, only 25% received help on this issue. It would appear that it is in such areas of large differences between problems and being helped that the main student needs lie. We cannot, of course, infer exactly the cause of these needs: a student subgroup may not know of existing help sources, may be reluctant to seek help, or may use them and not find them helpful. It is also possible that some concerns may not necessarily indicate the need for help: just because a student has a question about housing, for example, it does not always follow that a UMBC

person is the best way of obtaining an answer. Nonetheless, the following results are crucial data for addressing the needs of UMBC students.

For the general student population, as well as for all the student subgroups, looking for a job and career decision-making appear to be among the top needs. Blacks and other minorities seem to be particularly needy in these areas, with large discrepancies between having experienced concerns and having received help. Since such services are already offered at UMBC, fulfilling these needs might use one of several emphases: 1) offering these services specifically targeted at the needs of these minorities, and 2) public relations and advertising campaigns to inform and encourage these subgroups to seek existing help. Financial problems are also high on the list of students' needs for help, and may be linked to the need for a job.

A distinctive need that appears high only for Hispanics and Orientals is information about UMBC regulations and requirements. Since that population may be one that does not always seek help when it is needed, provision of services targeted to addressing this need would also need to consider the best way to reach these particular students.

Transportation to campus is a primary concern of several student subgroups: commuters in general, and older students and women in particular. It is not quite clear why these last two subgroups both experience more problems with transportation and receive somewhat less help than do other subgroups, but a clear direction is to focus on fulfilling this particular need by further exploring the difficulties experienced by these subgroups.

We do not mean to imply here that problem/help areas not mentioned are not needed. Although, for example, a student may not yet have experienced an illness on campus, the services need to be there when such a need arises. Furthermore, some preventative work on educating students so that so many needs will not arise would seem crucial.

Information sources. As we discuss involvement in activities and use of help sources, it becomes necessary to know how students find out about campus events. The most-used sources are the Retriever (87%), posters (65%), and flyers (43%). Departmental newsletters (13%) and radio stations (5%) are infrequently used by students to obtain UMBC information.

A few subgroup differences arose in this area. Residents (75% vs. 63%) and females (71% vs. 59%) tend to use posters more than commuters and males, respectively. Residents (55% vs. 40%) also use flyers more often than commuters; and black students (56%) use the flyers more than white (40%) or other-minority (32%) students.

These results have clear implications for the use of various types of advertising to reach each type of student. We cannot, of course, be sure whether these results indicate that a given source is seen more by students or that a source is used more frequently by clubs and departments, but we nonetheless suspect that more frequently-used sources are also noticed more by students.

Workshops. Of a wide variety of possible groups and workshops to assist students, the students were most interested in those consistent with the previously-discussed needs: Getting Yourself to Study (29%), Career Decision-making (27%), and Test Taking (22%) were the top three desires, for students in general. Another high need, for several subgroups (residents, females, blacks, other minorities), was for a workshop on Time Management.

Several consistent patterns occurred on subgroup differences. Residents tended to be more interested in participating in groups and workshops than did commuters, with most of these differences occurring on topics of personal development (e.g. assertiveness, self-esteem) rather than academic or skills areas. Blacks were more interested in every type of workshop than were whites, with other minorities in between these two subgroups. Finally, older students were more interested in groups on studying, self-esteem, leaderhip training, and survey research than were younger students.

Involvement in campus activities. It is a source of interest to determine what types of students are not active on campus. Are there some types who are getting lost in the crowd, or just coming to class and going home? Can we describe these types based on other characteristics?

To address these question we sorted our data according to students' involvement in campus activities. If a student responded that he or she had been involved in any activities, we called this student "Involved" (72%); students who were not in any activities we called "Uninvolved" (28%). We then looked to see how these two groups differed on the rest of the questions.

It was possible to develop a profile for the typical uninvolved student. Such students tend to be older than involved students, are more frequently white, and are more often married but separated. There are not significant differences in sex, class status, being an international student, or full-time or part-time status. The uninvolved students tend to live at home with their parents, to live somewhat closer to campus than involved commuters, and to drive their own car to campus (versus car-pooling, taking a bus, etc.). A few more of the uninvolved students have physical handicaps. About the same proportion of uninvolved and involved students have children.

While about the same percentage receive financial aid, fewer uninvolved students receiving such aid get assistance with living expenses. It is probable that this result is due to the higher number of uninvolved students living at home with their parents.

There are some differences in reasons for coming to college for involved versus uninvolved students. Uninvolved students were less likely to attend college in order to get a better job, and more likely to come because their parents wanted them to come. Perhaps these differences in motivation for coming to college in the first place continue to influence the students' interactions with the campus. There were differences regarding why the students chose UMBC in particular, or in the number of colleges to which involved versus uninvolved students applied.

One reason often postulated for a student's uninvolvement is the need to work at a paid job. Uninvolved students are employed on campus in about the same proportion as involved students, but the uninvolved ones work slightly fewer hours on campus. More uninvolved than involved students do work off campus, and the uninvolved students tend more frequently to work more than half-time off campus. Work, then, does seem to be one of several important factors related to a student's involvement on-campus. Students who are uninvolved on campus tend to work more off campus, although we cannot conclude than such work causes uninvolvement or vice versa.

According to our definition of uninvolvement and the above comments about off-campus employment, we would probably expect uninvolved students to spend less free time (when not in classes) on campus. Our results indicate that this conjecture is true: the typical uninvolved student (46%) reports that he or she spends some time occassionally on campus when not in classes, whereas the typical involved student (45%) reports frequently spending a lot of time on campus.

Do these differences in amount of time on campus arise due to necessity or to choice? We asked students how they felt about the amount of free time they spend on campus. Fewer uninvolved students (48%) were satisfied with their amount of free on-campus time, while involved students (67%) tended to be much more satisfied with this amount. The non-satisfied uninvolved students, however, were not of a single mind regarding their desire to spend more time here. 28% said they would like to spend more free time on campus but are unable to because of outside commitments. The other 24%, however, had no interest in spending more time here because nothing here interests them enough to stay here after classes. It is possible, then, that further activities and programs might involve this latter group more on campus, but there also seems to be a core group for whom it is not possible to commit themselves further here.

Consistent with their residences and their commitments, fewer uninvolved students spend time specifically in the library, residence halls, or gym and pool. More do, however, spend time in the commuter cafeteria. Perhaps uninvolved students involve themselves more informally in socializing, rather than through official UMBC functions and activities. The commuter cafeteria may be the optimal place for organizations and activities to be publicized, to reach the less involved students.

Are there information sources that differentially reach involved versus uninvolved students? Involved and uninvolved students are informed about the same amount through the Retriever, Events Boards, Departmental newsletters, direct mailings, and radio. However, for whatever reason, uninvolved students tend to find out about campus events less often through posters and flyers than do involved students.

It is interesting that involved and uninvolved students differ very little on the specific types of questions and problems they have had at UMBC and on the specific areas where they received help. The main difference in problem areas and help-receival comes in the numbers of students who have had no problems or have received no help. Uninvolved students more frequently did not have problems or questions and did not receive any help, as compared to involved students. It seems, then, that when an uninvolved student does have a specific problem or question, he or she will seek out help just as often as would a more involved student, but that overall the uninvolved students are less in need of such help. Once again, these results are consistent with the conceptualization of uninvolved students being less "hooked-in" to the university, in terms of both activities and services. They appear to have their needs fulfilled elsewhere.

It is, however, noteworthy that uninvolved students responded to the list of groups and workshops in a way equally favorable to that of involved students. Here we seem to have the one deviation from our conceptualization of uninvolved

students: although these students generally do not participate in most university activities and organizations, they do have some interest in obtaining further personal skills. One conjecture might be that the workshops are viewed by the uninvolved students as contributing to their personal lives and fulfillment, while clubs and activities might seem to take from more than give to such students. Consistent with the general pattern for all students, uninvolved students were most interested in workshops on getting themselves to study, career decision-making, and time management, all of which certainly would help them manage their busy lives more easily.

Summary

In conclusion, we would like to highlight five of the major findings of this study, and sketch some global implications of these findings. It is our expectation that more specific implications will suggest themselves to readers from various offices, according to their particular campus affiliation.

1. Students at UMBC are fairly pragmatic and career-oriented, manifested in their reasons for coming to college, their choice of UMBC, their current employment, and their problem areas.

Students appropriately see UMBC as a local school; indeed, they chose it for most of those reasons frequently cited by the campus as its raison d'etre. Students, by and large, seek to retain home and community connections while using UMBC fairly exclusively to meet the utilitarian considerations of career preparation. This kind of parochialism could serve to limit, to same real extent, the kind of fairly extensive modification of intellectual orientation in students said to be associated with the best of small, internally-focused, liberal arts colleges in which the majority of students live in. It would appear that UMBC will not become, for most students, a place for the "meeting of minds" - a crucible for intense, dispassionate inquiry and reflection. In appearing to serve the local community in the tangible and direct way it does, UMBC could be said to pay a

price - of a kind. Problems are only likely to arise, however, if there is a glaring discrepancy between the perceptions of students, in this regard, and those of faculty and other University officers. This may eventually be determined empirically, but this survey does not provide the information necessary to resolve this issue.

2. Females and black students appear to be less involved at UMBC and find less of interest to them here.

There is a large body of findings, accumulated primarily over the last 15 years, which speaks to the fact that involvement of racial and ethnic minorities (particularly in predominantly white, middle class, suburban campuses) is significantly less than that of whites. In the case of UMBC, the very strong local and community ties which many black students have is complemented by patterns of campus gathering which are largely, but not exclusively, across racial lines. Again, this latter phenomenon is seen on the majority of predominantly white campuses in which there is a much higher probability of blacks and other ethnic and racial minorities of being the first person in the family to attend college.

Although it seems important not to view the prevailing functional separateness in an exclusively perjorative way, it seems equally important to note that there are very real ways in which UMBC - - as a campus - loses out. Until the time comes at which blacks are able truly to identify with campuses such as UMBC, the separation will persist. Finally, a few recent studies have demonstrated that the relative lack of involvement of blacks in "mainstream" campus life may have clear positive outcomes for blacks: data in these studies suggest strongly that, whereas "knowing the system" is highly correlated with academic success for minority groups, "liking the system" and involvement are not. Nonetheless, the phenomenon will continue to pose a pointed challenge to administrative departments such as Campus Activities, student organizations, student groups and

faculty.

3. Each of the campus gathering places has its own distinctive student subgroup which it attracts.

The implications for this general finding are very much in the area of campus life, its quality, and how to use existing patterns of social organization to increase campus offerings for all students. Specifically, the identification of "naturally - occurring" groups and their association with a particular physical space will be of significant interest to Student Affairs departments whose staff can better focus on program development, and for certain academic departments whose offerings (for example) in the performing arts could thereby attract a wider audience.

4. There are important gaps between students' needs for help in certain areas and whether they actually receive such help.

This finding is one, while not unique to UMBC, bedevils direct service agencies such as counseling centers and health services. Any kind of "solution" must be sought in efforts to increase greatly "early warning" and primary prevention activities. If, indeed, many students who need assistance are not self-referring, UMBC needs to explore systems of mutual-support groups, referral "networks," outreach and liaison. It is, however, as much a challenge to academic departments (and not limited to the behavioral sciences) as it is to the Counseling Center and Health Services.

5. There is a sizable subgroup of students who are uninvolved on campus and for whom a profile can be described. Of these uninvolved students, about a quarter are <u>not</u> interested in spending more time on campus.

Such a finding, while not likely to engender complacency, is not untypical of urban and suburban commuting campuses, many of whose students are of mature age, are in careers, and who use campus offerings, including coursework, in a singularly (and necessarily) self-involved fashion. Traditional methods of "in-

viting in" such students do not work largely because these students are planfully using the campus in this fashion, and call for more "community" may simply be inappropriate. What is likely needed, however, is for UMBC to develop "mentor-type" persons on campus who are available - by phone, if necessary - as resources. The frequency and intensity of such contacts would then derive very much from the particular quality of the interaction. Campus-based resource persons might need to be able to play the role of ombudsman - to facilitate in the workings of the institutional bureaucracy.